

**BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION  
AND REVIEW COMMISSION**

MARK R. ANSON,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	Case No. 07R-736
	)	
v.	)	DECISION AND ORDER
	)	REVERSING THE DECISION OF
DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF	)	THE DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF
EQUALIZATION,	)	EQUALIZATION
	)	
Appellee.	)	

The above-captioned case was called for a hearing on the merits of an appeal by Mark R. Anson ("the Taxpayer") to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission ("the Commission"). The hearing was held in the Commission's Hearing Room on the sixth floor of the Nebraska State Office Building in the City of Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, on February 11, 2009, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued December 4, 2008.

Commissioners Warnes and Salmon were present. Commissioner Warnes was the presiding hearing officer. Commissioner Wickersham was excused from participation by the presiding hearing officer. A panel of three commissioners was created pursuant to 442 Neb. Admin. Code, ch. 4, §011 (10/07). Commissioner Hotz was absent. The appeal was heard by a quorum of a panel of the Commission.

Mark R. Anson was present at the hearing. No one appeared as legal counsel for the Taxpayer.

Thomas S. Barrett, a Deputy County Attorney for Douglas County, Nebraska, was present as legal counsel for the Douglas County Board of Equalization ("the County Board").

The Commission took statutory notice, received exhibits, and heard testimony.

The Commission is required to state its final decision and order concerning an appeal, with findings of fact and conclusions of law, on the record or in writing. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Cum. Supp. 2006). The final decision and order of the Commission in this case is as follows.

## **I. ISSUES**

The Taxpayer has asserted that actual value of the subject property as of January 1, 2007, is less than actual value as determined by the County Board. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Whether the decision of the County Board determining actual value of the subject property is unreasonable or arbitrary; and

The actual value of the subject property on January 1, 2007.

The Taxpayer has asserted that taxable value of the subject property as of January 1, 2007, is not equalized with the taxable value of other real property. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Whether the decision of the County Board determining the equalized taxable value of the subject property is unreasonable or arbitrary;

Whether the equalized taxable value of the subject property was determined by the County Board in a manner and an amount that is uniform and proportionate as required by Nebraska's Constitution in Article VIII §1; and

The equalized taxable value of the subject property on January 1, 2007.

## **II. FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Commission finds and determines that:

1. The Taxpayer has a sufficient interest in the outcome of the above captioned appeal to maintain the appeal.
2. The parcel of real property to which this appeal pertains ("the Subject Property") is described in the table below.
3. Actual value of the subject property placed on the assessment roll as of January 1, 2007, ("the assessment date") by the Douglas County Assessor, value as proposed in a timely protest, and actual value as determined by the County Board is shown in the following table:

Case No. 07R-736

Description: BAY WOOD LOT 11 BLOCK 0 IRREG, Douglas County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$80,400.00	Included in Total	\$80,400.00
Improvement	\$853,200.00	Included in Total	\$853,200.00
Total	\$933,600.00	\$763,190.00	\$933,600.00

4. An appeal of the County Board's decision was filed with the Commission.
5. The County Board was served with a Notice in Lieu of Summons and duly answered that Notice.
6. An Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued on December 4, 2008, set a hearing of the appeal for February 11, 2009, at 3:00 p.m. CST.

7. An Affidavit of Service which appears in the records of the Commission establishes that a copy of the Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing was served on all parties.
8. Actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date for the tax year 2007 is:

Case No. 07R-736

Land value               \$ 80,400

Improvement value\_ \$729,117

Total value             \$809,517

### **III. APPLICABLE LAW**

1. Subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission in this appeal is over all questions necessary to determine taxable value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(7) (Supp. 2007).
2. “Actual value is the most probable price expressed in terms of money that a property will bring if exposed for sale in the open market, or in an arm’s length transaction, between a willing buyer and a willing seller, both of whom are knowledgeable concerning all the uses to which the real property is adapted and for which the real property is capable of being used. In analyzing the uses and restrictions applicable to real property the analysis shall include a full description of the physical characteristics of the real property and an identification of the property rights valued.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).
3. Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, the (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in section 77-1371, (2) income approach, and (3) cost approach. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).

4. “Actual value, market value, and fair market value mean exactly the same thing.”  
*Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Board of Equalization, et al.*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 180, 645 N.W.2d 821, 829 ( 2002).
5. Taxable value is the percentage of actual value subject to taxation as directed by section 77-201 of Nebraska Statutes and has the same meaning as assessed value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-131 (Reissue 2003).
6. All taxable real property, with the exception of agricultural land and horticultural land, shall be valued at actual value for purposes of taxation. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) (Cum. Supp. 2006).
7. “Taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution.” *Neb. Const.*, Art. VIII, §1.
8. Equalization to obtain proportionate valuation requires a comparison of the ratio of assessed to actual value for the subject property and comparable property. *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999).
9. Uniformity requires that whatever methods are used to determine actual or taxable value for various classifications of real property that the results be correlated to show uniformity. *Banner County v. State Board of Equalization*, 226 Neb. 236, 411 N.W.2d 35 (1987).
10. Taxpayers are entitled to have their property assessed uniformly and proportionately, even though the result may be that it is assessed at less than the actual value. *Equitable Life v.*

*Lincoln County Bd. of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 60, 425 N.W.2d 320 (1988); *Fremont Plaza v. Dodge County Bd. of Equal.*, 225 Neb. 303, 405 N.W.2d 555 (1987).

11. The constitutional requirement of uniformity in taxation extends to both rate and valuation. *First Nat. Bank & Trust Co. v. County of Lancaster*, 177 Neb. 390, 128 N.W.2d 820 (1964).
12. In the evaluation of real property for tax purposes, where buildings and improvements are taxable as a part of the real estate, the critical issue is the actual value of the entire property, not the proportion of that value which is allocated to the land or to the buildings and improvements by the appraiser. *Bumgarner v. Valley County*, 208 Neb. 361, 303 N.W.2d 307 (1981).
13. If taxable values are to be equalized it is necessary for a Taxpayer to establish by clear and convincing evidence that valuation placed on his or her property when compared with valuations placed on similar property is grossly excessive and is the result of systematic will or failure of a plain legal duty, and not mere error of judgement. There must be something more, something which in effect amounts to an intentional violation of the essential principle of practical uniformity. *Newman v. County of Dawson*, 167 Neb. 666, 94 N.W.2d 47 (1959).
14. A presumption exists that the County Board has faithfully performed its duties and has acted on competent evidence. *City of York v. York County Bd. Of Equalization*, 266 Neb. 297, 64 N.W.2d 445 (2003).
15. The presumption in favor of the county board may be classified as a principle of procedure involving the burden of proof, namely, a taxpayer has the burden to prove that

action by a board of equalization fixing or determining valuation of real estate for tax purposes is unauthorized by or contrary to constitutional or statutory provisions governing taxation. *Gordman Properties Company v. Board of Equalization of Hall County*, 225 Neb. 169, 403 N.W.2d 366 (1987).

16. The presumption disappears if there is competent evidence to the contrary. *Id.*
17. The order, decision, determination, or action appealed from shall be affirmed unless evidence is adduced establishing that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016 (8) (Cum. Supp. 2006).
18. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence. See, e.g. *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).
19. "Clear and convincing evidence means and is that amount of evidence which produces in the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction about the existence of a fact to be proved." *Castellano v. Bitkower*, 216 Neb. 806, 812, 346 N.W.2d 249, 253 (1984).
20. A decision is "arbitrary" when it is made in disregard of the facts and circumstances and without some basis which could lead a reasonable person to the same conclusion. *Phelps Cty. Bd. of Equal. v. Graf*, 258 Neb 810, 606 N.W.2d 736 (2000).
21. A decision is unreasonable only if the evidence presented leaves no room for differences of opinion among reasonable minds. *Pittman v. Sarpy Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 258 Neb 390, 603 N.W.2d 447 (1999).

22. “An owner who is familiar with his property and knows its worth is permitted to testify as to its value.” *U. S. Ecology v. Boyd County Bd. Of Equalization*, 256 Neb. 7, 16, 588 N.W.2d 575, 581 (1999).
23. The County Board need not put on any evidence to support its valuation of the property at issue unless the taxpayer establishes the Board's valuation was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Bottorf v. Clay County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 162, 580 N.W.2d 561 (1998).
24. A Taxpayer, who only produced evidence that was aimed at discrediting valuation methods utilized by the county assessor, failed to meet burden of proving that value of property was not fairly and proportionately equalized or that valuation placed upon property for tax purposes was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Beynon v. Board of Equalization of Lancaster County*, 213 Neb. 488, 329 N.W.2d 857 (1983).
25. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the subject property in order to successfully claim that the subject property is overvalued. Cf. *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981); *Arenson v. Cedar County*, 212 Neb. 62, 321 N.W.2d 427 (1982) (determination of equalized taxable value) *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Board of Equalization for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value).

#### IV. ANALYSIS

The subject property is an improved residential parcel with a 1 ½ story house of 4,296 square feet built in 1996. (E2:2). The house is rated as very good in quality and good in condition. (E3:1).



The subject property was inspected on August 22, 2008 and corrections made to change the style from 2 story to 1 ½ story and to redraw the second floor resulting in a reduction of the square footage from 4,653 as show in Exhibit 9 page two to 4,296 as shown on Exhibit 3 page one. (E2:3). Despite the adjustments associated with these corrections, the assessed 2007 valuation of \$933,600 remained the same. (E2:3).

The Taxpayer provided evidence of six (6) sales of parcels which he alleged were comparable to the subject property. (E8:3) Three of the six parcels were comparables also used by the County. (E2:5).

Of the three alleged comparable parcels provided by the Taxpayer one parcel is most remarkable, that parcel shown as Exhibit 33. This parcel is remarkable first because the Taxpayer testified that he believed it was the most comparable to the subject property of the six parcels that had sold. Second, the Taxpayer had been inside of parcel shown as Exhibit 33 and his testimony was that its physical attributes and ratings for quality and condition were similar to the subject property and as shown on the property record card for that parcel shown as Exhibit 33. (E33:6) The only differences to which he testified were that the condition of the parcel shown as Exhibit 33 was very good and it was built in 2002. (E33:6). Both of these differences would increase the valuation of the parcel shown as Exhibit 33. The Taxpayer testified that the subject property had a swimming pool while the parcel shown as Exhibit 33 did not, but this physical attribute was not included in the calculation of valuation for the subject property as shown on the Market Calculation Detail sheet of the property record file for the subject property. (E3:4).

That “comparable properties” share similar quality, architectural attractiveness (style), age, size, amenities, functional utility, and physical condition. *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., International Association of Assessing Officers, 1996, p. 98.

That when using “comparables” to determine value, similarities and differences between the subject property and the comparables must be recognized. *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 1996, p.103. Most adjustments are for physical characteristics. *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 1996, p.105.

The Commission finds after a review and comparison of the physical attributes and ratings of condition and quality of that the parcel shown on Exhibit 33 and the testimony received from the Taxpayer, and a review of the property record file for the subject property, that the parcel shown as Exhibit 33 and the subject property are comparable. (E33 and E2).

The Commission notes that the valuation history of the parcel shown on Exhibit 33 was initially \$960,000 for 2007 before a protest was filed with the Douglas County Board of Equalization (DCBOE). (E33:9). As a result of that protest, the DCBOE decreased the 2007 valuation to \$820,000. (E33:9).

“Equalization is the process of ensuring that all taxable property is placed on the assessment rolls at a uniform percentage of its actual value. The purpose of equalization of assessments is to bring assessments from different parts of the taxing district to the same relative standard, so that no one part is compelled to pay a disproportionate share of the tax. Where it is impossible to secure both the standards of the true value of a property for taxation and the uniformity and equality required by law, the latter requirement is to be preferred as the just and ultimate purpose of the law. If a taxpayer's property is assessed in excess of the value at which

others are taxed, then the taxpayer has a right to relief. However, the burden is on the taxpayer to show by clear and convincing evidence that the valuation placed upon the taxpayer's property when compared with valuation placed on other similar property is grossly excessive.” *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597, 597 N.W.2d 623, 635 (1999).

Where “the discrepancy was not the result of an error of judgment but was a deliberate and intentional discrimination systematically applied” the Taxpayer’s right to relief is clear. “The right of the taxpayer whose property alone is taxed at 100 per cent of its true value is to have his assessment reduced to the percentage of that value at which others are taxed even though this is a departure from the requirement of statute. The conclusion is based on the principle that where it is impossible to secure both the standards of the true value, and the uniformity and equality required by law, the latter requirement is to be preferred as the just and ultimate purpose of the law.” *Kearney Convention Center v. Buffalo County Board of Equalization*, 216 Neb. 292, 304, 344 N.W.2d 620, 626 (1984).

The Commission takes note of the County’s referee’s written comment during the protest review process that “Some equalization needed in area”. (E6:2).

Nebraska law makes it clear that when properties are comparable to the extent that the subject property is to that parcel shown in Exhibit 33, the County Board has the plain duty to value them similarly. *Zabawa v Douglas Cty. Bd. Of Equal.*, 17 Neb.App. 221,227, 757 NW2d 522, 528 (2008). “The Board’s failure to do so is sufficient to rebut the presumption that its decision was correct.” *Id.* “To set the valuation of similarly situated property, i.e., comparables at materially different levels, i.e. value per square foot, is by definition unreasonable and

arbitrary, under the Nebraska Constitution.” *Scribante v Douglas Cty. Bd. Of Equal.*, 8 Neb. App. 25, 588 N.W. 2d 190 (1999).

The improvements on the parcel shown on Exhibit 33 were assessed at the rate of \$169.72 per square foot ( \$730,000/4,301 square feet). (E33:6 and E33:9). The improvements on the subject property have been assessed at the rate of \$198.60 per square foot (\$853,200/4,296 square feet). (E3:2 and E3:5). To equalize the subject property to the parcel shown in Exhibit 33 the assessed valuation of the subject property should be reduced to \$729,117.12 (\$169.72 x 4,296 square feet) plus the land valuation of \$80, 400 for a total valuation of \$809,517.

The Commission finds that the subject property and the parcel in Exhibit 33 are comparable. The Commission further finds that the presumption has been rebutted by competent evidence by virtue of the subject property and the parcel in Exhibit 33 not being valued similarly. The Commission also finds that the County Boards failure to equalize the valuation of the subject property and the parcel shown in Exhibit 33 is clear and convincing evidence that the decision of the County Board was arbitrary or unreasonable. The Taxpayer is granted relief on this appeal and the tax valuation of the subject property is valued at \$809,517 for 2007.

## **V. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Commission has subject matter jurisdiction in this appeal.
2. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties to this appeal.
3. The Taxpayer has produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its official duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.

4. The Taxpayer has adduced sufficient, clear and convincing evidence that the decision of the County Board is unreasonable or arbitrary and the decision of the County Board should be vacated and reversed.

**VI.  
ORDER**

**IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. The decision of the County Board determining actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date, January 1, 2007, is vacated and reversed.
2. Actual value, for the tax year 2007, of the subject property is:

Case No. 07R-736

Land value               \$ 80,400

Improvement value\_\$729,117

Total value             \$809,517

3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer, and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Cum. Supp. 2006).
4. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this order is denied.
5. Each party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
6. This decision shall only be applicable to tax year 2007.

7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on March 4, 2009.

Signed and Sealed. March 4, 2009.

---

Nancy J. Salmon, Commissioner

---

William C. Warnes, Commissioner

**SEAL**

**APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF THE COMMISSION MUST SATISFY THE  
REQUIREMENTS OF NEB. REV. STAT. §77-5019 (CUM. SUPP. 2006), OTHER  
PROVISIONS OF NEBRASKA STATUTES, AND COURT RULES.**